

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH**

CR-3202-2019 (O&M)
Date of decision: 15.05.2019

Amarjeet Kaur and another

...Petitioners

Versus

Ranbir Singh and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE H.S. MADAAN

Present: Mr. Ishaan Bhardwaj, Advocate
for the petitioners.

H.S. MADAAN, J. (Oral)

This revision petition is directed against order dated 19.03.2019, passed by Civil Judge (Sr. Divn.) Panchkula, vide which, an application seeking permission for further cross examination of plaintiff No.1 and other evidence has been dismissed by the trial Court. The other order being challenged is dated 03.04.2018, vide which, evidence of the plaintiffs was closed by order.

I have gone through the impugned orders and I do not find any illegality or infirmity therein. A perusal of the impugned order dated 03.04.2018 goes to show that the plaintiff had availed of 10 effective opportunities to conclude her evidence. No PW was present on that date, therefore, evidence of the plaintiff was closed by Court order. The order is being challenged after one year and is hopelessly time barred. No reasonable and plausible explanation has been given as to why the order

was not challenged within period of limitation. Even otherwise, if the plaintiff failed to conclude her evidence despite availing of 10 effective opportunities and the trial Court closed her evidence by order, no fault can be found with the order, so passed by the trial Court. Coming to the other order which is being challenged, the one dated 19.03.2019, the plaintiff herself had moved an application seeking permission for further cross examination of plaintiff and leading other evidence. The Court found that the application so filed was not maintainable, since evidence of the plaintiffs had been closed, vide order dated 03.04.2018 and that the application had not been moved by the defendants. The defendants themselves had availed of 12 opportunities to lead evidence. As such, application so filed by the plaintiffs was dismissed.

There is no illegality or infirmity in the impugned orders, much less apparent on the face of it, which might have called for interference by this Court while exercising revisional jurisdiction. There being no merit in the revision petition, the same stands dismissed.

15.05.2019

sumit.k

(H.S. MADAAN)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned :	Yes	No
Whether Reportable :	Yes	No